

REMARKS

The Office Action of August 24, 2005, and the cited art have been carefully considered. The recognition of allowable subject matter in claims 2, 3, 8 and 9 is gratefully acknowledged. The application has been amended to eliminate unnecessary limitations and to correct grammatical and similar errors. Reconsideration of the rejection of the application is respectfully requested based on the amendments and following discussion.

OBJECTIONS:

The Specification was objected to for an incorrect identification
The Specification has been amended.

Claims 1 and 14 were objected to for grammar.
Claims 1 and 14 have been amended.

REJECTION 102:

1. Claims 1-2, 6, 9-12, 14-15, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as anticipated by Netting; US 2,434,951

Netting '951 shows two fluorescent tubes electrically connected end to end by a bracket that fits within the outer diameter of the tubes. Netting '951 further shows a reflective exterior faces extending between the tube ends at 45 degrees to reflect light evenly in a radial direction.

Netting '951 fails to provide a prima facie case of invalidity under 35 USC 102, since Netting '951 fails to show, suggest, state or claim a limitation included in applicants' claims. Netting '951 fails to teach a:

“an interior wall defining a receptacle volume having a first region conforming to the exterior wall of the first lamp adjacent the end of the first lamp;

“ and having a second region conforming to the exterior wall of the second lamp adjacent the end of the second lamp;”

“wherein the first region [by implication an interior wall region] further includes a light reflective surface facing the end of the first lamp and the second region further includes a light reflective surface facing the end of the second lamp;

“the receptacle further defining a light transmissive aperture commonly adjacent to the end of the first lamp and to the end of the second lamp receiving light from the first region and the second region. ”

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the rejected claims are therefore respectfully requested.

REJECTION 103:

2. Claims 3-5 and 7 were rejected under 35 USC 103 over Netting ‘951 U.S. in view of Ceglia; US 3,202,814.

Nettring ‘951 fails to show, teach or suggest anything about a coupler with a reflective internal wall directing light to a transmissive region between the lamp ends.

Ceglia ‘814 shows transparent cylindrical coupler with beveled ends. The prismatic function of the bevels is best seen in FIG. 6. It is clear that Ceglia ‘814 does not use a light reflective region on the coupler interior. Rather the whole of the interior surface is light transmissive. There is no suggestion to insert a reflective surface, and in fact to do so would inhibit the light transmission to the reflective beveled surfaces. This would be contrary to the function of the optical structure disclosed in Ceglia ‘814. Inserting a reflective surface in Ceglia ‘814 is the wrong thing to do. Ceglia ‘814 does not make the Applicant’s claimed structure obvious.

Ceglia ‘814 radiates the redirected light in all directions around the gap between the lamp ends, that is the goal. Ceglia ‘814 fails to define an aperture through which the received light is transmitted. Ceglia ‘814 is trying to illuminate the whole ring around the lamp ends, so there is no suggestion to illuminate only a spot, as with an aperture. It is not obvious how an aperture would be defined in Ceglia ‘814 that would at the same time not interfere with the collection of the light, and emit the collected light through an aperture. Ceglia ‘814 does not make the Applicant’s claimed structure obvious.

Withdrawal of the rejection and reconsideration of the rejected claims are therefore respectfully requested.

It is believed that a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made, that the Application as amended is patentably distinct over the cited art, and that the case is now in condition to be passed to issue. Reconsideration of the amended application is therefore requested, and an early favorable notice of allowance is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By: William E. Meyer

William E. Meyer

Reg. No. 30,719

Attorney for Applicants

OSRAM SYLVANIA INC.

100 ENDICOTT STREET

DANVERS, MA 01923

(978) 750-2384

(978) 750-2045 FAX